IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS SAN ANTONIO DIVISION

In re: KrisJenn Ranch, LLC, Debtor	& & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & &	CHAPTER 11 CASE No. 20-50805
KrisJenn Ranch, LLC, KrisJenn Ranch, LLC-Series Uvalde Ranch, and KrisJenn Ranch, LLC-Series Pipeline ROW, as successors in interest to Black Duck Properties, LLC, Plaintiffs, v. DMA Properties, Inc. and Longbranch Energy, LP, Defendants.	$oldsymbol{\omega}$	Adversary No. 20-05027
DMA Properties, Inc., Cross-Plaintiff/Third-Party Plaintiff v. KrisJenn Ranch, LLC, KrisJenn Ranch, LLC-Series Uvalde Ranch, and KrisJenn Ranch, LLC-Series Pipeline ROW, Black Duck Properties, LLC, Larry Wright, and John Terrill, Cross-Defendants/Third-Party Defendants	ω	Adversary No. 20-05027

MOORE'S RESPONSES AND OBJECTIONS TO KRISJENN'S FIRST REQUESTS FOR ADMISSIONS

Moore hereby serves his responses and objections to KrisJenn Ranch, LLC, KrisJenn Ranch, LLC-Series Uvalde Ranch, and KrisJenn Ranch, LLC-Series Pipeline ROW First Requests for Admissions.

Respectfully,

/s/ Christopher S. Johns
Christopher S. Johns
State Bar No. 24044849
Christen Mason Hebert
State Bar No. 24099898
JOHNS & COUNSEL PLLC
14101 Highway 290 West, Suite 400A
Austin, Texas 78737
512-399-3150
512-572-8005 fax
cjohns@johnsandcounsel.com
chebert@johnsandcounsel.com

/s/ Timothy Cleveland
Timothy Cleveland
State Bar No. 24055318
CLEVELAND | TERRAZAS PLLC
4611 Bee Cave Road, Suite 306B
Austin, Texas 78746
512-689-8698
tcleveland@clevelandterrazas.com

Attorneys for Frank Daniel Moore and DMA Properties, Inc.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on December 11, 2020 a true and correct copy of the foregoing document was transmitted to each of the parties via the Court's electronic transmission facilities and/or via electronic mail as noted below. For those parties not registered to receive electronic service, a true and correct copy of the foregoing document was served by United States Mail, first class, postage prepaid, at the address noted below.

Ronald J. Smeberg	Michael Black	
Charles John Muller, IV	BURNS & BLACK PLLC	
MULLER SMEBERG, PLLC	750 Rittiman Road	
111 W. Sunset	San Antonio, TX 78209	
San Antonio, TX 78209	mblack@burnsandblack.com	
ron@smeberg.com		
john@muller-smeberg.com	Jeffery Duke	
,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	DUKE BANISTER MILLER & MILLER	
Counsel for KrisJenn Ranch, LLC,	22310 Grand Corner Drive, Suite 110	
Krisjenn Ranch, LLC, Series Uvalde	Katy, TX 77494	
Ranch, KrisJenn Ranch, LLC, Series	jduke@dbmmlaw.com	
Pipeline Row	,	
	Counsel for Longbranch Energy, LP	
Ronald J. Smeberg	Shane P. Tobin	
THE SMEBERG LAW FIRM, PLLC	OFFICE OF THE U.S. TRUSTEE	
2010 W Kings Hwy	903 San Jacinto Blvd, Room 230	
San Antonio, TX 78201-4926	Austin, Texas 78701	
ron@smeberg.com	shane.p.tobin@usdoj.gov	
Counsel for Black Duck Properties, LLC	United States Trustee	
William P Germany	John Terrill	
BAYNE, SNELL & KRAUSE	12712 Arrowhead Lane	
1250 N.E. Loop 410, Suite 725	Oklahoma City, OK 73120	
San Antonio, TX 78209	-	
wgermany@bsklaw.com	Third Party-Defendant, pro se	
Counsel for Larry Wright		
Laura L. Worsham		
JONES, ALLEN & FUQUAY, L.L.P.		
8828 Greenville Avenue		
Dallas, TX 75243		
lworsham@jonesallen.com		
Counsel for McLeod Oil, LLC		

/s/ Christopher S. Johns
Christopher S. Johns

OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO REQUESTS FOR ADMISSIONS

Request for Admission No. 1: Admit that Wright told you that you would receive 20% of Black Duck's 15% interest for the life of the TCRG project.

Response: Deny.

Request for Admission No. 2: Admit that you told TCRG that you had an interest in the ROW that ran with the land.

Response: Admit.

Request for Admission No. 3: Admit that you told TCRG that you had a net profits agreement in the ROW.

Response: Moore objects that the phrase "net profits agreement in the ROW" is ambiguous. Moore construes "net profits agreement in the ROW" as meaning a net profits agreement that conveyed to DMA a net-profits interest that attaches and runs with the ROW. Based on that construction and interpretation of the ambiguous phrase, admit.

Request for Admission No. 4: Admit that you told TCRG that you had a net profits agreement in the pipeline.

Response: Moore objects that the phrase "net profits agreement in the pipeline" is ambiguous. Moore construes "net profits agreement in the pipeline" as meaning a net profits agreement that conveyed to DMA a net-profits interest that attaches and runs with the ROW and related pipeline facilities. Based on that construction and interpretation of the ambiguous phrase, admit.

Request for Admission No. 5: Admit that told TCRG that your net profits interest was a real covenant.

Response: Admit.

Request for Admission No. 6: Admit that you told TCRG that your net profits interest was a personal covenant.

Response: Deny.

Request for Admission No. 7: Admit that you told TCRG that Wright had made false statements to it regarding the ROW.

Response: Admitted that Moore told TCRG that DMA has a net-profits interest that attaches and runs with the right-of-way, which implies that any contrary representations by Wright were false. Otherwise, denied.

Request for Admission No. 8: Admit that you told TCRG that Wright had made false statements to it regarding the Pipeline.

Response: Moore objects that the word "Pipeline" is unambiguous when taken in context of the relevant agreements. Moore construes "Pipeline" to mean the right-of-way and related pipeline facilities. Under that construction, admitted that Moore told TCRG that DMA has a net-profits interest that attaches and runs with the right-of-way, which implies that any contrary representations by Wright were false. Otherwise, denied.